



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/579,072	12/22/1995	ADAM S. WYSZYNSKI	49581/P006US/09604915	3750
29053 7590 08/02/2007 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P 2200 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201-2784			EXAMINER CHAN, RICHARD	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>08/579,072</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>WYSZYNSKI, ADAM S.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Richard Chan</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2618</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 15-18 and 20-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13, 15-18 and 20-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 13-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13, 15-18, 20-22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto (US 5,361,395) in view of Kaschke (5,555,550) and in further view of Eastmond (US 4,606,075).

With respect to claim 13, Yamamoto discloses a system for processing radio frequency signals comprising: an input to the circuit for receiving an RF signal (12); a mixer having an input connected to the RF signal input (connection between items 12 and 14); a first filter having an input connected to an out put of the mixer (connection between items 14 and 15); a first amplifier having an input connected an output of the first filter (connection between 15 and 16); a second filter having one input connected to an output of the first amplifier (connection between 16 and 17); and a second amplifier having an input connected to the out of the second filter (connection between 17 and

Art Unit: 2618

19), and the output connected to an output of the circuit (connection between 19 and 20), however Yamamoto does not explicitly show wherein said first filter is a low pass filter and wherein the mixer, first and second filters and first and second amplifiers are constructed on a single integrated substrate.

The Kaschke reference however discloses putting the electrical components on a single integrated substrate circuit is very well-known in the art; and also, it is an obvious choice of design as evidenced by Kaschke (col. 3, lines 28-35).

Kaschke discloses a radio telephone wherein the electrical components are constructed on a single integrated substrate. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the components on a single integrated substrate in order to reduce size, weight, or components.

And the Eastmond reference discloses wherein the first filter 13 (Figs.2 – 5) are a low pass filter after a mixing stage from mixer 128 of Fig.1 is processing the Q signal after mixing. The limitation that is claimed discloses a first filter have an input connected to an output of said mixer, no where do the claims mention any direct connection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the specific AGC control circuitry of Eastmond and the teaching of electrical components constructed on a single integrated substrate by Kasche to filter higher frequency noise and in order to reduce size, weight, or components respectively to the RF receiver of Yamamoto.

With respect to claim 15, Yamamoto further discloses wherein said first amplifier means is a variable gain amplifier. (fig.1, item 16)

With respect to claims 16 and 20, Yamamoto further discloses the second filter means is an intermediate frequency, band-pass filter (fig. 1, item 17).

With respect to claims 17 and 21, Yamamoto further discloses the second amplifier means is an fixed gain amplifier FGA (fig. 1, item 19 is not a variable gain amplifier).

With respect to claim 18, Yamamoto discloses (Fig.1)the method of processing radio frequency (RF) signals, the method comprising the steps of: receiving an input RF signal (12); mixing said input RF signal (connection between items 12 and 14) with an operating frequency signal to generate a first signal; filtering said first signal to generate a second signal (connection between items 16 and 17), wherein said filtering said first signal includes processing said first signal through a filter 15; amplifying to a fixed level with amplifier 16 said second signal to generate a third signal, wherein said amplifying said second signal to generate a third signal includes amplifying said second signal by a variable gain amplifier (VGA) 16; the limit of said VGA being, the maximum level acceptable by, said third signal filtering step through filter 17 without distortion: filtering said third signal to generate a fourth signal; and amplifying said fourth signal a fixed amount with amplifier19 to generate a fifth signal at the output of amplifier 19; the Yamamoto reference however does not specifically disclose wherein the first filter is a

Art Unit: 2618

low pass filter and wherein said mixing, filtering and amplifying steps are performed on a single integrated circuit substrate.

The Kaschke reference however discloses putting the electrical components on a single integrated substrate circuit is very well-known in the art; and also, it is an obvious choice of design as evidenced by Kaschke (col. 3, lines 28-35).

Kaschke discloses a radio telephone wherein the electrical components are constructed on a single integrated substrate. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the components on a single integrated substrate in order to reduce size, weight, or components.

And the Eastmond reference discloses wherein the first filter 13 (Figs.2 – 5) are a low pass filter after a mixing stage from mixer 128 of Fig.1 is processing the Q signal after mixing. The limitation that is claimed discloses a first filter have an input connected to an output of said mixer, no where do the claims mention any direct connection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the specific AGC control circuitry of Eastmond and the teaching of electrical components constructed on a single integrated substrate by Kasche to filter higher frequency noise and in order to reduce size, weight, or components respectively to the RF receiver of Yamamoto.

With respect to claim 22, Yamamoto, Kaschke, and Eastmond combined disclose the circuit of claim 13, Yamamoto continues to disclose wherein said first amplifier 13

Art Unit: 2618

operates to amplify an output signal from said first filter to a maximum level acceptable as an input to said second filter to avoid distortion of said RF signal. (Col.4 line 1-5)

With respect to claim 24, Yamamoto, Kaschke, and Eastmond combined disclose the circuit of claim 18, Yamamoto continues to disclose wherein said first amplifier 13 operates to amplify an output signal from said first filter to a maximum level acceptable as an input to said second filter to avoid distortion of said RF signal. (Col.4 line 1-5)

4. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto (US 5,361,395) in view of Kaschke (5,555,550) and in view of Eastmond (US 4,606,075) in further view of Umezawa (US .

With respect to claims 23 and 25, Yamamoto, Kaschke, and Eastmond combined disclose the circuit of claim 22, however none of the references specifically disclose wherein said RF signal is a video signal.

The Umezawa reference however discloses wherein a handy type video telephone equipment for receiving and transmitting a voice signal and a video signal. (Abstract)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the receiver designed to accept video RF signals as well as audio RF signals as disclosed

Art Unit: 2618

by Umezawa with the receiver as disclosed by Yamamoto, Kaschke, and Eastmond combined in order to provide video streaming to the mobile device.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Chan whose telephone number is (571) 272-0570. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri (9AM - 5PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on (571)272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Richard Chan
Art Division 2618
7/26/07



NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER